

Appl. No. 10/618,743
Reply to the Office Action of October 27, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 have been canceled. Claims 13-20 are active in the case.

The present invention relates to amide compounds that are useful in the treatment of amnesia or dementia.

Claim Rejection, 35 USC 112, First Paragraph

The basis for the new matter rejection is not understood since ample basis can be found for the definitions of groups R¹, Y, Q and R² in the text of the specification.

As to the definition of R¹ as acyl in Claim 13, such is clearly stated at page 2, line 26 of the text, as well as at page 14, lines 29-32. Further, R² is supported by the disclosure at page 15, lines 2-12 of the text, and Y and Q are taken from original Claim 5.

As to the scope of the term R² in Claim 14 as arylamino substituted by halogen or pyridylamino, the same is supported by original Claim 2.

Basis for the definition of R¹ as set forth in Claim 19 can be found on page 13, lines 18-24. Support for R² as phenylamine in Claim 19 can be found on page 15, lines 16-19 of the text. Clearly, the present claims do not introduce new matter into the case with respect to the definitions of group R¹.

Claims 13-20 do not introduce new matter into the case with respect to these groups. Accordingly, the new matter rejection of the claims is without merit and withdrawal of the rejection based on 35 USC 112 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/618,743
Reply to the Office Action of October 27, 2005

Having canceled Claims 1-5 and 7-9, the issues set forth in paragraph 3 of the Office Action are believed obviated. Only Claims 13-20 remain active in the case.

It is now believed that the application is in proper condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Frederick D. Vastine, Ph.D.
Registration No. 27,013

Customer Number
22850

Tel: 703-413-3000
Fax: 703-413-2220
NFO/FDV